

REMARKS

The further non-final Office Action dated October 12, 2006 has been received and carefully considered. No amendments to the claims have been made at this time. For reasons discussed in detail below, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the Office Action are improper and that the pending claims are allowable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, careful reconsideration of the rejections, in light of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

The applicant urges the Examiner to once again give full and careful consideration to the arguments made in the applicant's previous response dated July 14, 2006 the full content of which is expressly incorporated into these remarks by reference. The descriptions and graphics given in the applicant's previous response provide a great explanation of the features and advantages of the present invention. For sake of brevity, such descriptions shall not be repeated herein, but they are equally significant with respect to the current rejections, and therefore the Patent Office is respectfully requested to give them careful and sufficient consideration.

Although a new secondary reference (Merriman et al.) has been cited in the current office action, the secondary reference is no more substantive than the previously cited references, and does not disclose or suggest the features of the pending claims, as shall be discussed in greater detail below. Hence, the claims

should be allowable over the cited prior art basically for the same reasons argued in the applicant's previous response. Indeed, the applicant has argued essentially the same things consistently throughout the prosecution of this application. This is now the *fourth* consecutive non-final rejection issued in this case. In each of these non-final rejections, the Examiner attempts a different secondary reference, which is alleged to make up for the admitted deficiencies of the primary citation, Watchfogel et al. Time and time again, the secondary references do not disclose or even remotely suggest the essential claimed features of a "storing means comprising a multi-level storage hierarchy for storing advertisements, in which the levels of said multi-level storage hierarchy gradually fractionalize advertisement areas into increasingly more specific geographic regions," and of "categorizing advertisements so as to belong to respective levels of geographic fractionalization within said multi-level storage hierarchy."

In the current Office Action, claims 1 to 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wachtfogel et al., cited previously, in view of Merriman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,061).

The applicant respectfully submits that the current rejection of record is improper and without basis. Specifically, the newly cited secondary reference, Merriman et al., clearly does not make up for the admitted deficiencies of the primary reference, Wachtfogel et al.

In particular, as in the previous Office Actions, in the current Office Action, on page 3, lines 8-12, the Examiner openly admits that "Wachtfogel et al. fail to teach an inventive concept wherein advertisements are arranged into more specific geographic area[s] by categorizing the advertisements as to belong to respective levels of geographic fractionalization within a multi-level storage hierarchy, categorizing the advertisements according to area sections within respective levels, and categorizing the advertisements according to content thereof."

However, the newly cited reference, Merriman et al., does not make up for the admitted deficiencies of Wachtfogel et al. Despite the Examiner's indication of a section in this reference, which is alleged to disclose the above features, it is quite clear that Merriman et al. do not even remotely suggest the structure of the claimed storage hierarchy, in which advertisements are arranged within different storage levels (e.g., Levels 1 to 4 discussed in the applicant's former response and as shown in FIG. 2 of the present specification) having increasingly more specific geographic fractionalization. With respect to this feature, the Examiner has referred to column 5, lines 10 to 63, of Merriman et al. (see, current Office Action, page 3, lines 9 to 13).

Merriman et al. is no more relevant than the other secondary references, which have been cited by the Examiner in past office actions. Merriman et al. do not show or suggest the claimed features of a "storage means comprising a multi-level storage hierarchy for storing advertisements, in which the levels

of said multi-level storage hierarchy gradually fractionalize advertisement areas into increasingly more specific geographic regions," or of "categorizing advertisements so as to belong to respective levels of geographic fractionalization within said multi-level storage hierarchy."

On the contrary, Merriman et al. merely disclose a method for targeting delivery of advertisements over the Internet, based on, first, identifying the user by means of the user's IP address and possibly cookies, which are linked to an existing database of known information (targeting profile criteria) about the user, one item of which may include the user's geographic location. Thus, once the actual user is identified, and in the case that such geographic information is used, advertisements could be delivered to the user from businesses targeting the actual location of the user. On the other hand, if the user cannot be identified, a generic advertisement is displayed or a promotional advertisement may be displayed to get the user to provide personal information to be entered into the database.

Initially, the present invention does not rely on any type of user database, containing personal information about the user including the user's actual location. In fact, the user's actual location is not even important to the present invention. On the contrary, when using the present invention, a person may be looking for job or help-wanted advertisements in locations far away from that person's actual geographic location.

Further, unlike the present invention, there is no system disclosed or even remotely suggested in Merriman et al. for

controlling the number of job or help-wanted advertisements made available for display to the user, so that the user is always supplied with an appropriate number of advertisements (neither too great nor too small) depending on the category of job that the user is searching.

Specifically, the indicated section of Merriman et al. does not disclose the claimed feature of a "storing means comprising a multi-level storage hierarchy for storing advertisements, in which the levels of said multi-level storage hierarchy gradually fractionalize advertisement areas into increasingly more specific geographic regions." That is, the cited reference does not disclose the hierarchical storage structure illustrated in FIG. 2, in which each lower level further subdivides or fractionalizes the geographic regions into increasingly more specific smaller geographic regions (i.e., level 1 countries → level 2 provinces or states → level 3 counties or prefectures → level 4 cities or municipalities). Moreover, lacking the claimed hierarchical storage structure, it is a foregone conclusion that Merriman et al. cannot suggest the claimed feature of "categorizing advertisements so as to belong to respective levels of geographic fractionalization within said multi-level storage hierarchy."

As before, the applicant strongly emphasizes that neither of the cited references shows any appreciation of the aim of the present invention, which is to adaptively adjust the number of job or help-wanted advertisements made available for display, depending on the category or type of job being sought.

According to the present invention, job advertisements for highly skilled positions, for example, university professorships, are categorized in the first level having a lowest level of geographic fractionalization defined by respective country area sections. Therefore, if one were to search for such job advertisements, even though few or no jobs fitting this category may exist within a confined local region such as the user's own city, still an appropriate number of different job advertisements can be displayed, since the advertisements are culled from a much wider geographic area. On the other hand, job advertisements for unskilled positions, for example, jobs for waitresses, are categorized, e.g., in the fourth level of geographic fractionalization defined by cities or municipalities. Therefore, when searching for such job advertisements, only those advertisements from a selected city region are displayed, so that the user is not flooded with an overabundance of job advertisements. In either case, depending on the type of jobs being sought, by linking the type of job being sought with the proper level of geographic fractionalization, an appropriate and reasonable number of job advertisements are made available for viewing.

In particular, the features of the claimed invention are of great utility for job searching using small portable mobile terminals, such as cellular phones, where the amount of information that can be displayed is limited by screen size. By adaptively controlling the amount of information made available depending on the category of jobs being sought (i.e., by

categorizing the job advertisements based on job types within a multi-level storage hierarchy having different geographically fractionalized levels), the present invention enables more effective use of Internet connected portable mobile terminals for job hunting activities.

By contrast, Merriman et al. only concerns targeting delivery of advertisements, using a compiled database of user information including the geographic location of the user. There is no hint of the essential "categorizing of advertisements" and "geographic fractionalization" features of the claimed invention.

In fact, according to Merriman et al., since the advertisements supplied to each user are targeted based on the actual location of the user, unlike the present invention, users may not even receive advertisements from regions outside of their actual location. Therefore, it is quite apparent that Merriman et al. cannot achieve the same effects and advantages as the claimed invention.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention would not have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the present invention was made. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of pending claims 1 to 13, is respectfully requested.

The present response is accompanied by a request for a one-month extension of time for replying to the office action, along with timely payment for the extension. No additional fees are currently due. Notwithstanding, in the event that fees, or deficiencies in fees, are deemed necessary in connection with

this or any accompanying communication, such fees may be charged to the Attorney's Deposit Account 07-2519.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Paul A. Guss', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Paul A. Guss
Reg. No. 33,099
Attorney for Applicants

CS-37-010822
775 S. 23rd St. #2
Arlington, VA 22202
Tel. 703-486-2710